





# THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

akin to the boasted patriarchal society of the latter. It is eminently a Western civilization looking to the development of the individual man, and to the construction of the social fabric upon a basis of once of independence and self-dependence. Here with us are neither Fourierite ideas, nor plantation aristocracies. Ours is a growing State, and needs population and labor, and it is to this condition of things, and in view of these wants that we should shape our policy, and in conjunction with surrounding States build our faith upon Western measures. It would be absurd for Missouri to ape the fanaticism of South Carolina upon the slavery issue, as it would be to imitate Massachusetts upon the ultra Abolition issue. Those who would have her people embark in the cause of Southern radicalism and secession—who would have them sacrifice every interest of society to a wild agitation in behalf of slavery—these are not the blind leaders of the blind, and have neither a true conception of the destiny that awaits our State, nor a full and just appreciation of the many social evils that are already attendant upon the institution as it exists among us. I am, Sir, no alarmist, and I have no desire to go needlessly into a discussion of the domestic relations between master and slave. It is not needed that I should comment upon that theme in order to a fair presentation of the matter before us. It will be sufficient to point to the meaning of the views expressed in regard to Western civilization by affirming that practical emancipation is flowing from natural causes, is one of the most striking developments, and to add that those who have lived and acted and felt amid communities where slavery existed, know something of its attendant evils, and something of its occasional abuses.

They know that among the whites the chief sufferers are the young, and among the blacks the aged that slavery superinduces thriftlessness in boyhood, extravagance in manhood, and poverty in the decline of life, and that taken even in its best light there are many things about its domestic character over which it is prudent to draw the veil. On this point, therefore I desire to say no more. What I have said has been dictated by no prejudice, but by an earnest desire to represent all the bearings of this subject of emancipation in its true light. Even this may be considered by some as unwarranted liberty, and I may be told that in the cant language of the day, as not being "loyal to the institution of the State." Sir, I am loyal to the welfare of Missouri, and I hold that transcends in importance any institution. But I am not and never will be "loyal" in the sense of blind adherence to everything that may be established. Such loyalty would be a crime against the spirit of the age. Sir, was Virginia loyal to her institutions when she abolished primogeniture? Was Pennsylvania loyal to hers when she abolished slavery? Were the colonies loyal to theirs when they abolished royalty? This is the cry which high and mighty statesmen, and the existing institutions shout out all reform. There is but one institution to which all citizens should be loyal, and that one, the sovereignty of the people. All other institutions must conform to that or cease to exist. Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition to prolong my remarks. I have said in substance what I designed saying in regard to the past, the present, and the future aspects of the slavery issue that has been forced upon us by the Senate resolution. The suddenness with which it has been sprung—the one day's notice only of the introduction of the proposition that has been accorded to us—the inability to obtain access to this remote place, and the valuable sources of information that would have thrown much light upon the subject, have all conspired to render very imperfect what has been attempted. But, Sir, if nothing else has been accomplished this day, one thing has transpired, and that is the bringing up of the whole subject for future discussion. The introduction of this resolution has made emancipation henceforth and forever an open question in Missouri. I presume, Sir, that when the inquiry has been moved by those who claim to be the exclusive guardians of the slave interest in this State, those who may think otherwise than they, who may feel solicited for other interests, and be concerned directly in the encouragement of a more exalted species of labor, will not hesitate to speak out their opinions. When the champions of the negro bondsmen press forward to inaugurate their belief, and the members of this General Assembly, the vindicators of the rights of the white man, the freeman, the working man, will not be slow to appeal to the verdict of an enlightened public sentiment. Hence it is that I venture to say emancipation is henceforth an open question in Missouri. That resolution is the warrant for full, fearless and conscientious examination in all the after time. None other is needed. If it were, it could be found in the highest instrument of writing in our organic law. The Constitution of Missouri has made provisions concerning the emancipation of all the slaves in the State. The first article of the 26th section while defining and limiting the power of the General Assembly "for the emancipation of slaves," yet points out two modes in which it may be done. The course of coming events was clearly foreseen by those who framed the Constitution, and this great change was discussed and provided for in accordance with ideas that then prevailed. It was, moreover, incorporated into the organic law that the Constitution itself could be amended upon this as well as all other subjects by two successive General Assemblies. If, then, Sir, I or you, or any other, may be impelled to urge a radical but gradual reform in regard to the institution of slavery, may we not, with the Constitution of Missouri in hand—with high considerations of the welfare of the State, and with the rights of the citizens of 800,000 free white citizens in our keeping—may we not, I say, feel fully prepared to stand forward and answer at bar of public opinion with triumphant and convincing argument?

## THE ORIGINAL DRED SCOTT A RESIDENT OF MISSOURI.

### SKETCH OF HIS HISTORY.

The distinguished colored individual who has made such a noise in the world in the case of Scott against Sanford, and who became so tangled up with the Missouri Compromise and other great subjects—Dred Scott—is a resident, not a citizen, of St. Louis. He is well known to many of our citizens, and may frequently be seen passing along Third street. He is an old inhabitant, having come to this city thirty years ago.

Dred Scott was born in Virginia, where he belonged to Capt. Peter Blow, the father of Henry C. Blow and Taylor Blow of this city. He was brought by his master to St. Louis about thirty years ago, and in consequence of the laws of that property of Dr. Emerson, a surgeon in the army, whom he accompanied on that trip to Rock Island and Fort Snelling, on the ground of which he based his claim to freedom. The wife of Dr. Emerson was formerly Miss Sanford, and is now Mrs. Chaffs, who he has married twice, his first wife, by whom he had no children, having been sold from him. He has had four children by his present wife—two boys, both dead, and two girls both living. Dred was at Corpus Christi at the breaking out of the Mexican war, and was captured by Capt. Bainbridge, who he speaks of as a "good man."

On his return from Mexico he applied to his mistress, Mrs. Emerson, then living near St. Louis, for the purchase of himself and family, offering to pay part of the money down, and give an annual citizen of St. Louis, as security for the remainder. His mistress refused his proposition, and Dred being informed that he was entitled to his freedom by the operation of the laws regulating the North-West Territory, forthwith brought suit for it. The suit was commenced about ten years ago, and has cost Dred \$500 in cash, besides labor to a nearly equal amount. It has given him a "heap of trouble," he says, and he had known that "it was going to last so long," he would not have brought it. The suit is defended by Mr. John Sanford, as executor of Dr. Emerson's will.

Dred does not appear at all discouraged by the issue of the celebrated case, although it seems him to slavery. He talks about the affair with the ease of a veteran litigant, though not exactly in technical language, and is largely tickled at the idea of finding himself a personage of such importance. He does not take on airs, however, but laughs heartily when talking of "de fuss dey made in Washington 'bout de case."

He is about fifty five years old, we should think though he does not know his own age. He is of mixed African blood, and as black as a piece of charcoal. For two or three years past he has been running at large, with no one exercising ownership over him or putting any restraint upon his movements. If he were disposed to make the attempt, he could gain his freedom at a much less cost than even one-tenth of the expense of the famous suit. He will not do so, however, insisting on abiding by the principles involved in the decision of the suit. He declares that he will stick to his mistress as long as he lives. His daughters, Eliza and Lucy, less conscientious about the matter, took advantage of the absence of restraint on their movements, a year or two since, to disappear, and their whereabouts remains a mystery.

Dred, though illiterate, is not ignorant. He has traveled considerably, and has improved his stock of strong common sense by much information picked up in his journeys. He is anxious to know who owns him being ignorant whether he is the property of Mrs. Chaffs or Mr. Sanford, though, we presume, there is no doubt that the former is his legal owner. He seems to be of a running about, with no one to look after him, while at the same time he is a slave. He says, grinningly, that he could make thousands of dollars, if allowed, by traveling over the country and telling who he is.

## THE FREEDOM OF THE PRESS.

The report of the joint committee appointed by the New York Legislature was presented on Thursday by Mr. Foot in the Assembly, and Mr. Madden in the Senate, defining the position of the Empire State upon the subject of Freedom of the Press. Let the millions of Slavery see how glorious New York, wheels into line! Read it, friends of Freedom, and rejoice!

The Joint Committee of the Senate and Assembly appointed to consider and report what measures, if any, the Legislature of the State ought to adopt to protect the Constitutional rights of her citizens against the serious and alarming doctrines of the Supreme Court of the United States in the decision of the case of Dred Scott, respectively.

### REPORT:

That they entered upon a discharge of their duty under a deep sense of the importance of the subject committed to their consideration. They could not fail to see that the sovereignty of our State, the constitutional rights of her citizens, the protection of her free labor, her great commercial and manufacturing and agricultural interests, her extensive educational system, and the morals of her citizens, were all assailed and put in jeopardy by the unconstitutional, sectional and Pro-Slavery doctrines announced by the majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States in the decision of the case mentioned; for those doctrines will bring slavery within our borders, against our will, with all its unhallowed, demoralizing, and blighting influences.

Your committee have not been able to obtain authenticated copies of the opinions of the five Pro-Slavery Judges, who were the majority of the Court, and proclaimed the unconstitutional doctrines which have so justly alarmed the people of this State. They have, however, abundant evidence of their contents and of the principles they announce.

First: They express the opinion that if a master brings his slave into a Free State for a temporary sojourn, the slave does not become free. This is in direct contradiction to a cherished principle of the common law, that when a slave places his foot upon free soil he becomes a freeman—a principle dear to the heart of every enlightened citizen of the Free States of our Union; and a principle which has been recognized by the Courts of every Free State, by the Courts of most of the Slave States, and by the Supreme Court of the United States itself.

Second: They express the opinion that the Ordinance 1787—the Magna Charter of Freedom in all the States formed out of the Territory north-west of the Ohio River—is a law of no higher authority than the laws of the State which it was intended to supersede, and is in direct opposition to the action of the General State Governments, from their institution.

Third: They declare that the Act of Congress admitting the State of Missouri into the Union, known as the Missouri Compromise, was unconstitutional and void; and hereby give the sanction of their names and of the Court, to the unmitigated breach of pledged national faith accomplished by the repeal of that act.

Fourth: They declare and express the opinion that the clause in the Constitution of the United States which declares that "the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States," applies to the Territory which was ceded to the United States when the Constitution was adopted, and confers no authority on Congress to pass laws regulating the Territories acquired since, and thus they deny to Congress the power to exclude Slavery from them, or to authorize a local law government to exclude it while exerting influence over person in the country known that every Territory which the United States has acquired since the adoption of the Constitution has been governed by the laws of Congress. The power of Congress over those Territories, and the authority prohibited Slavery in them, has never been questioned, till the promulgation of the opinions of the majority of the Court in this case of Dred Scott.

Fifth: They declare it to be their opinion that Slavery is not a local institution. They hold that it is not confined to the limits of the States by laws of which it is created, but may be carried beyond them, and into the Territories of the United States. This opinion is in direct opposition to at least three solemn decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and to the decisions of the Courts of all the Free States, and to the decisions of the courts of most, if not all, of the Slave States of our Union. It is contrary to one of the fundamental principles of the common law, viz: that every man has an inalienable right to his liberty, and that it can only be taken from him by a statute of the State in which he lives; and every try in the profession of the law knows that the Statute of a State has no force beyond its limits.

It follows as direct consequence of this doctrine that a master may take his slave into a Free State, dissolve the relation of master and slave, and your committee cannot but be alarmed and shocked at the apprehension that some future decision of the pro-slavery majority of the Supreme Court will authorize a slave driver, as threatened by the devotees of Slavery, to call the roll of his many man, and his ancestors for many generations before him also freemen, and though ninety-nine parts out of one hundred of the blood which runs in his veins is Anglo Saxon, and his skin whiter, and his heart purer, and his head clearer than that of the judge who outlaws him, and though his father may have fallen in the battle of New Orleans, on the glorious eighth of January, at the call of our Jackson, or his son, or his grand-father served with honor, or died in battle under our Washington, a violation of the sacred principles announced in our Independence, hostile to the spirit of our institutions and the age in which we live, a departure from the liberal doctrines of the common law, and opposed to the weight of judicial authority in this country and England.

Your committee have no hesitation in express-

ing the opinion that this decision is erroneous and ought to be overruled; that they believe it will be overruled as soon as the Free States have the opportunity to be heard on the bench of that Court.

The attention of your committee was arrested by a proposition, stated by Chief Justice Taney in the opinion he delivered, as the organ of a majority of the Court in the following words: "They (the colored race) had no rights which white men were bound to respect." Your committee cannot but be shocked and indignant at this proposition, which is a direct denial of the rights of man, and a disgraceful and a dishonorable utterance, and to the tribunal which sanctioned it.

The most censurable part of the conduct of these five Pro-Slavery Judges yet remains to be stated, and it is this: The five constitutional questions which were not involved in the case, but which were brought before the Court for decision, and upon which in violation of judicial decorum and established precedents, they volunteered opinion, have, within the last two years, become political and party questions, have divided the two great political parties of the country, and that division, unfortunately, has assumed a sectional character. These five Judges are all located in the Pro-Slavery section, and identified with the Pro-Slavery party. Under such circumstances, if true manly delicacy did not, a decent respect for the feelings and opinions of the friends of free institutions should have restrained them from uttering a single word not necessary to the decision of the question before them. Yet how widely different was their conduct! They volunteered, against decorum and precedent, to identify themselves and our great National Court with a sectional party, and to bring down that high tribunal from the lofty place it hitherto filled in the reverential respect of the nation, to the arena of party and sectional strife. They have destroyed the confidence of the people in the Court by stamping upon it a black mark of sectionalism and party spirit, never placed before, and which themselves and the Court they control, in the front ranks of Pro-Slavery propagandism, and offensive aggression upon the rights of the Free States.

Your committee cannot omit to notice in this connection the time selected by the five Judges for taking ground in this manner, and for making a party question of the decision of the Supreme Court. That time was "strikingly propitious to protect them from impeachment and accomplish their purpose. A new Pro-Slavery, sectional Administration was just being inaugurated, and consequently had the whole patronage of the Federal Government to aid in screening the Pro-Slavery Judges from the consequences of their unconstitutional and offensive conduct, and to produce acquiescence in their ultra Pro-Slavery, unconstitutional doctrines. The fate of Kansas, was then impending, and these doctrines, if carried out, would consign her to the deadly embrace of Slavery. Your committee reluctantly admit the thought that the five Judges, in their conduct, had in view such an ulterior purpose; but they have seen too many evidences of the desperate acts to which Pro-Slavery fanaticism leads men subject to its influence to lay aside the fearful apprehension that our National Court has been brought under its influence.

The Supreme Court of the United States was established by our forefathers to secure a fair and impartial exposition of the Constitution, and an independent and impartial adjudication of Constitutional questions, and thereby preserve the rights of the several States and the citizens thereof. The influence and power of the Court having now been marshalled on the side of Pro-Slavery propagandism, and against the rights of the Free States, it no longer accomplishes the purpose of the institution. The safety and peace of the nation require its reorganization; so as to admit into it a fair and equal representation of the Free States, according to the ratio of population between the Free and Slave States, which can and ought promptly to be done by act of Congress. Until this measure is accomplished, it is manifestly the duty of the Free States, to maintain a firm stand against the encroachments of Slavery, and keep this direful evil out of her borders.

To this end, your committee announce and recommend the adoption of the proposition that slavery shall never pollute the free soil of the Empire State, and that no slave shall be brought into the Empire State on the Republican doctrines of 1788 known as the "Virginia Resolutions," which were acquiesced in by the great Republican party of that day, and in the face of the fact that this Assembly had previously and explicitly and peremptorily declared that it views the powers of the Federal Government as resulting from the compact, to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument which created it, and that no further rights than they are authorized by the grants enumerated in that compact; and that in case of a deliberate, palpable and dangerous exercise of other powers, not granted by the said compact of the States, who are the parties thereto, have the right, and are in duty bound, to resist by all means, and by all the powers, to the extent of the law, within their respective limits, to the exercise of the rights and liberties pertaining to them.

To carry into effect this proposition, your committee recommend the adoption of the resolutions hereinafter presented, and the passage of an act entitled "An act to secure freedom to all persons within this State."

SAMUEL A. FOOT,  
JOHN L. LINCOLN,  
JOHN H. WOODSTOCK,  
EDWARD M. MADDEN,  
JOHN T. HOGBOOM,  
HENRY W. BECKWITH.

ALBANY, April 9, 1857.

Resolved, That this State will not allow Slavery within her borders, in an form, or under any pretence, or for any time, however short, let the consequence be what may.

Resolved, That the Supreme Court of the United States, by reason of a majority of the Judges thereof having identified it with a sectional and aggressive party, has lost the confidence and respect of the people of this State.

Resolved, That the Governor of this State be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to transmit a copy of this report, the law above mentioned, and these resolutions, to the respective Governors of the States of this Union.

AN ACT TO SECURE FREEDOM TO ALL PERSONS WITHIN THIS STATE.

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Sec. 1. Neither descent, race or remote, from an African, whether such African is or may have been a slave or not; nor color of skin, shall disqualify any person from being, or prevent any person from being, or prevent any person from becoming a citizen of this State; nor deprive such person of the rights and privileges of a citizen thereof.

Sec. 2. Every slave who shall come, or be brought or be, in this State with the consent of his or her master or mistress, or who shall come or be brought, or be involuntarily in this State shall be free.

Sec. 3. Every person who shall hold, or attempt to hold, in this State a slave, or who shall bring any person mentioned as a slave in the second section of this act, or any free person of color, in any form, or under any pretence, or for any time, however short, shall be deemed guilty of felony, and shall be liable to imprisonment in the State Prison at hard labor for a term not less than two nor more than ten years.

A slaveholder coming from Virginia to this city, recently, to hunt for one of his lost chattels. He spent some time, with the aid of police, in mousing around the localities inhabited by the colored people, but without success. Having heard something of the markets of spiritualism, and how the dead come back to their friends, "tickling like a clock," it occurred to him that, perchance, some inhabitant of the land of disembodied intelligence might take pity on him in his extremity, and, playing the part of a blood-brother, put him on the track of his missing slave. In a state of mind excited and anxious mood, he visited first a medium, through whom spirits are said to communicate by taking possession of her body and using her organs of speech. All that we know of what transpired in the presence of this medium is derived from the statements made by the slave hunter himself, who

said that, permitting himself for a time to be "possessed" by some spirits in affinity with him, he poured out a stream of profanity which made his hair stand on end. Her own spirit friends came at length to the rescue, and after delivering her from this diabolical possession, told him that he was surrounded by degraded and malicious spirits, who could not be permitted to manifest themselves to him through her. He next visited a rapping medium. Taking his seat at the table, he began to question invisible agency. "Do you know what I came here for?" Yes (three raps). "Was it to buy goods?" No. "Was it to visit my relations?" No. After several other specifications, he asked bluntly, "Did I come to catch a nigger?" Yes (three heavy raps). The medium promptly informed him that no spirit capable of affording any aid to the accomplishment of such a purpose was ever permitted to approach her, or even to come anywhere into her neighborhood. Her spirit friends were all antislavery, and deeply interested in the success of the Underground Railroad. Whether he visited any other mediums or not, we cannot tell. But the slave-hunter returned to his home to meditate upon the uncertainty of that "peculiar property" which is the chief source of wealth and poverty in the Old Dominion.

We publish this story because we are assured of its essential truth, and not on account of any bearings which it may be supposed to have upon the cause of Spiritualism, so called, which lies out of the proper domain of a journal like ours.—A. S. Standard.

## "WOMEN HELD AS CATTLE."

"My wives and daughters," says the native Kafir, "are my cattle, my oxen, my cows, my horses, my mules, my wagons. I bought my wife, and paid for her; and I have a right to beat or kill her if I choose, as much as to beat or kill my goat or my dog, for she is mine. My daughters also are my cattle, my money, my merchandise; and I wish them to learn to dig, and not to read and pray."

The above is taken from the *Journal of Missions*, published by the A. B. C. F. M. Now, "women are held as cattle" in fifteen of the States of the American Union, and yet I have never seen any allusion to the melancholy fact, similar to the above, in the *Journal of Missions*. It is said, the Board is a foreign Missionary Society, and therefore it is not its province to notice obstructions to the world's conversion in our own land! But it does profess to notice impediments to the conversion of the world at home and abroad. Why then maintain perpetual silence with regard to the Great Obstruction in the United States? Again, the Indians of this country are included by the Board in the field of Foreign Missions, and among the Choctaws and Cherokees, where it has missionaries, are "women held as cattle." How cheering would it be to see in the pages of the *Journal*, something like the following:

"WOMEN HELD AS CATTLE.—My concubines and daughters," says the American slaveholder, "are my cattle, my oxen, my cows, my horses, my mules, my wagons. I bought my concubine and paid for her; and I have a right to beat or kill her, if I choose, as much as to beat or kill my goat or my dog, for she is mine. My daughters also are my cattle, my money and my merchandise; and I wish them to learn to dig, and not to read and pray."—American Missionary.

## The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

SALEM, OHIO, APRIL 18, 1857.

### MISSOURI.

The present state of feeling on the slavery question at St. Louis, and other parts of Missouri is of much significance to all interested in the question. To give our readers a full view of the state of affairs we publish Mr. Brown's speech delivered in the Legislature of the state last winter. From this speech, from the action of the Legislature and from other events of recent occurrence especially the result of the late election of St. Louis, it is manifest that there is a considerable number of the inhabitants of the state who are the opponents of slave labor on their soil.—Of these persons there seem to be two classes.—The one in favor of gradual emancipation by Legislative action, the other proposing to wait for the eradication of the system, till free labor shall expel it by its own natural and inevitable action, which, with Mr. Brown, they hold to be in the course of rapid accomplishment. The position of one of the American candidates at the late election is thus defined by a St. Louis paper:

"In regard to emancipation, Dr. Lane occupies what we regard, and what every sagacious man who reflects on the matter must regard, as the only true ground. He is in favor of letting it alone, and allowing it to work itself out. He considers that legislative interference with the subject would not only be unnecessary, but positively harmful. He hopes to see, not the emancipation of the slaves, but the extinction of slavery in Missouri, and in this respect differs from Mr. Palm, Mr. Gareche and other anti-Benton emancipators, who are in favor of the liberation of the slaves."

The party in Missouri styled the emancipation party, makes no pretensions to abolitionism as a moral principle. It proposes to be the "White Man's Party." It seeks to secure the rights of free labor by the expulsion of slave labor. For example one of the calls to a political meeting of the party just before the election runs as follows:

WORKINGMEN'S DEMONSTRATION!  
Free Labor to Make Missouri the Empire State of the Union, and St. Louis the Empire City of the West!

Let the masses Turn Out, and Battle for their Cause!

White Men for our City, and our City for White Men!

Free Travel, Free Rivers!

It is a movement of self-defence on the part of the commercial interests of St. Louis, and the interests of Free Labor, against the degrading and crushing interests of slavery. We hope it is the inauguration of a movement which may reach the ignorant and oppressed non-slaveholding whites of the south generally. A class whose interests are affected by slavery in a degree only secondary to that of the slaves themselves, and whom from their ignorance, prejudice, and oppressed condition, it is almost as difficult to reach and move to any work of self-emancipation as the slaves themselves, but who if once aroused will make the power of slavery speedily totter to its fall. Of course we look upon this movement with the deepest interest and heartily wish it the most abundant success. And the people of the states whose constitutions do not tolerate slavery may give the free laborers of Missouri most direct and efficient aid by directing their own public sentiment in the most radical anti-slavery channel. If we but lead off on the score of principle we may hope ere long to see these mere political economists and men of expediency taking a higher and nobler position, and while they defend their own rights manifesting also a manly purpose to defend and uplift those of their fellow victims who are far more wronged than themselves.

We should have stated that the St. Louis election was decided in favor of the emancipation candidates by a majority of 1,700 votes. A result which is announced by the Catholic, Democratic, pro-slavery organ of the city in the following paragraph:

There is no use crying over spilt milk, or spilt ink either. The Blair-Wimer-Bornstein-Brown, anti-Benton, Black Republican, Abolition, socialist Emancipation party, have carried the city by about 1,700 majority—and much good may it do them.

The press most prominent in the advocacy of emancipation measures is the *Democrat*, which is denounced by opponents as an "abolition sheet." This paper speaking of its position, bravely says, in its strictures upon the pro-slavery letter of Col. Benton:

"For our own part, we have only to say that, in conjunction with the Democracy here, we have been battling in the past for great principles. The rights of the white man are dear to our heart—the cause of white labor is the cause of our own citizens. The progress and growth of white population is an essential element in the coming grandeur, not less of Missouri than of St. Louis. The meridian splendor of these Western States with the lofty part they are hereafter to play in the affairs of this nation, must rest upon no policy of Slavery Extension or Slavery perpetuation. For these things we have staked everything in perilous times that have gone by, and these things we do now pledge ourselves never to forsake in the future. Others may abandon the field, and forget their faith, and shrink from the issue; but we are not of such stuff. The banner has been unfurled too long to be stricken now, it is glorious with too recent a victory to be trailed in the dust at this day; and we proclaim it, therefore, that, come the assault from what quarter it may, and be the opponents whoever may set it to engage, we shall stand to those colors as long as a ribbon of them flutters in the breeze."

Since the election the same paper says: The returns of our charter election, which we publish this morning, will show a noble and profitable victory achieved by the free white working men of St. Louis. We call it noble, because it has vindicated the rights of the dignity of white labor; we call it profitable, because it is but the precursor of many others that are to follow. After an animated contest, with all the engineering of consolidated party drill against it, with all the stereotyped traditions of past politics to encounter, and all the force and animosity of slavery prejudices and slavery timidity hanging as it were over the movement, the cause of the white man, the free man, the laboring man, has been the successful cause.

This victory likewise is the more gratifying—the more to be rejoiced at—the more to be solemnized in the hereafter—inasmuch as the triumph has been achieved by no evasive canvass—no concealment of principle—by no false pretences or questionable doctrines. The issue was boldly made by the Nullifiers, and is boldly met—Free Labor was assailed in its stronghold, and Free Labor stood up for its rights and vindicated its dignity not less than its authority. The question was thrown down by the advocates of slavery perpetuation, and it was manfully taken up by the Democracy and by those who look forward to ultimate emancipation as a coming and a passing necessity of state policy. Violent and denunciatory attacks upon free speech and a free press were met by still firmer thoughts, and still more emphatic utterance. And the result has answered the expectation of the most sanguine. From fifteen hundred to two thousand majority over the acknowledged champion of the opposition is what we may claim in point of numbers, and in point of prestige we may claim every thing.

It remains to be seen what use the great party which has just achieved a victory so unlooked for by the country—so confidently expected by themselves—will make of their triumph. Will they give up the ground they have won, and return to their tents with no longing for conquest.—We trust not. We trust that what they have now done for themselves they may hereafter be induced to do for others. We trust that as they have gained a battle in their own persons, they will not hesitate, hereafter, to aid in leading their strength to gain a battle for their friends in the State likewise. Push on to the phalanx of victory. "Nulli retrosum vestigia!"

The *Intelligencer*, the "American" organ says: We have at no time doubted that St. Louis is "Free State" in sentiment by a heavy majority. This fact has long been notorious here. It has been the case for years; but the proverbial sensitiveness of a Slave State community to any discussion of Free State principles, has heretofore kept the Free State feeling in abeyance. It has been evoked at last and rises at once into political ascendancy. This ascendancy, it strikes us, is likely to be permanent. For while it is true that hundreds of men voted for Mr. Wimer, who are not in favor of Emancipation, it is also true that hundreds voted for him, who are thorough Emancipationists in sentiment as he is.

The election of the Wimer ticket is, therefore, only the emphatic declaration of the city of St. Louis, not only on the expediency, but the certainty of the early extinction of Slavery in Missouri. For it were very foolish in St. Louis to proclaim a policy that was of doubtful strength, and thus court isolation to the phalanx of the rest of the State.

## LIFE OF THOMAS MORRIS.

Of all the pioneers of the anti-slavery movement in the West, none held a nobler position than Thomas Morris. He was early in the field, when obloquy, reproach and loss of popular favor were his reward. But prompted by humanity and guided by principle he never hesitated or faltered in his course. His personal influence was always in favor of liberty, and in his public acts he never forgot the slave. As a lawyer, a member of the Ohio Legislature, and of the United States Senate, he fearlessly and oftentimes nearly alone, defended and successfully urged his principles. As a popular lecturer he also willingly served the cause, when to do so was to encounter slander and mobocratic violence. A most remarkable history for a politician who had been popular and successful for so many years. But with him Democracy was a principle to be embodied in individual and political action, not to shield the grossest enormities.

A son of Mr. Morris has recently published his biography, accompanied with liberal selections from his writings and speeches. And though one can but feel disappointment at not finding more of personal history in the volume, yet the book is a valuable one. Mr. Morris' speeches which are thus preserved in permanent form would alone give it a claim to the highest regards of the public.

A LUCKY MAN.—"Jim Breckenridge," a slave of Louisville Ky., on Tuesday of last week, was so fortunate as to draw the half of a \$30,000 prize in a lottery. His master, Isaac R. Greene, a lawyer of the city, very magnanimously waived his slaveholding claim to the prize and recommended his fortunate chattel to buy himself and family at such prices as should be designated by some disinterested person, mutually agreed upon. The valuation has been fixed, the slaves emancipated and the remainder of the funds placed in the hands of a Trustee for the benefit of the emancipated family.

The Model Republic, contains about four millions and a half of native born inhabitants, who, according to the highest judicial authority of the country, "have no rights which a white man is bound to respect." Just think of that. And one half millions of these are mocked with the name of "free person." What a glorious union! How successful in establishing justice and securing the blessings of liberty.

## SUPREMACY OF MORAL POWER.

How common it is to meet with men who have unbounded faith in political quackery—who believe that voting is a specific for moral diseases. Politicians take the smallest quantity of truth whose value is known and add an immeasurable amount of falsehood and error; then they write certificates of cures for newspapers and certify to the sovereignty of the remedy by stump speeches, and the results are honorable positions and lucrative offices. They have obtained the votes of the people; but have they achieved a triumph over wrong and injustice and oppression? A fearful negative comes up from the maddened slave and from the wretched victim of intemperance.

And yet, men, with a strong infatuation cling to the voting policy as a means of eradicating evil, when it can never be justly regarded as any more than the index of achievement. These people forget if they ever knew, that two of the most signal triumphs ever obtained by the brotherhood principle, were won without the sanction of law, without the intervention of law and I may add without the knowledge of law.

One of our best historians says—"It is remarkable that the two greatest and most salutary social revolutions which have taken place in England, that revolution which, in the thirteenth century, put an end to the tyranny of nation over nation, and that revolution which, a few generations later put an end to the property of man in man, were silently and imperceptibly effected. They struck contemporary observers with no surprise and have received from historians a very scanty measure of attention. They were brought about neither by legislative regulation nor by physical force. Moral causes noiselessly effected, first the distinction between Norman and Saxon, and then the distinction between master and slave. None can venture to fix the precise moment at which either distinction ceased. Some faint traces of the old Norman feeling might perhaps have been found late in the fourteenth century. Some faint traces of the institution of villenage were detected by the curious so late as the days of the Stuarts; nor has that institution even to this hour, been abolished by statute."

If then in England the antipathy of races was overcome by the slow and natural growth of principles, if the system of villenage was destroyed by the power of public opinion, why should we doubt the potency of similar causes, to produce in this country, similar results?

In saying this, I do not undervalue the agency of the ballot or of political manifestoes. We shall need these in the formation of a new Republic; but it is another and a more potent power that produces fraternity, that creates a demand for a government free in practice as well as in principle. Would that we had more faith in moral power, that we better comprehended the grandeur of its mission and the extent of its influence.

J. E. J.

THE WAY THE HOOSIERS DO IT.—There are now and then to be found persons who dissent from the outcry against political preaching; and sometimes a community is to be found where such preaching is decidedly popular. Such pulpits, we are happy to learn, are not likely to be made vacant consequence of the Democratic jealousy of a union of church and state. By a letter from an Indiana correspondent, we learn that there is at least one community of Hoosiers, who know how to get a gospel to their liking. Certainly they are very sensible business men. Our correspondent says:

"We nearly all here, belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and we work anti-slavery in our own way. We bid a premium for the best anti-slavery sermon. The more radical the more pay. We say: 'One sermon is worth as much, another is not worth as much, and the market value is estimated by its radical character. This mode of dealing has its influence on the character of the gospel we are called upon to listen to. Before he went away, he preached that it was wrong to be a Christian who in any way, either aided or apologized for slavery. That certainly looked like a very thorough conversion. Lately some of our Methodist christians who belong to the Democratic party, got their backs and their courage up, and challenged us to discuss with them the question of the Divine origin of slavery. They could prove it from the Bible. Well, we had our discussion, and a rich time at that. Another meeting was appointed, when the Presiding Elder came along and forbade it else we should doubtless have had another."

THE LEGION OF LIBERTY AND FORCE OF TRUTH. Containing the thoughts, words and deeds of some prominent apostles, champions and martyrs. Illustrated with engravings. Published by the American Anti-Slavery Society, 138 Nassau St. New York, 1857.

Such is the quaint title of a book which every friend of freedom will delight to possess. The work is an old one, the Anti-Slavery Society having issued a new edition. The book is a remarkable depository of facts put in the most available form for the use of all who are engaged in the great conflict with Slavery. It contains also an admirably condensed history of the present anti-slavery movement brought down to the admission of Texas. Its most prominent feature is its record of the opinions of illustrious men, in regard to slavery—a "legion" of the world's nobles—men and women who stand forth the champions of justice and liberty—witnesses summoned from the present and the past, from all nations and ages—Poets, Philosophers, Statesmen, Divines, Authors, Laborers, Soldiers—John Wilkes, William Penn, Milton, Shakespeare, Whitfield, Hannah More, Francis Wright, Jeremy Bentham, Rousseau, Buffon, Montaigne, and a host of others. The book is indeed a valuable one. Those who wait facts whereof to combat and silence their pro-slavery neighbors will find them here.

The book can be had at McMillan's Book Store, for the small sum of 50 cents, or fifty cents remitted to him, will secure it by mail, postage paid. Postage stamps should be sent in such case.

Send on at once and get a valuable book.







do, \$7, and every hundred thereafter at an additional.

Where we have no Agents, Farmers, by sending name in full, number of acres in farm, the township, county, State and amount, as above, enclosing twenty per cent. for all sums over \$5, will receive a deed by return mail.

Registered Letters at our risk—charge to be sent in postage stamps.

The patentee of this Fence has nearly perfected a simple Self-Opening Gate, (extra cost about \$3 per gate,) which those forwarding money for